

## **REMARKS**

### **I. Introduction**

The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated January 22, 2008. This communication is believed to be a full and complete response to that Office Action. The Office Action was non-final. Claims 1-18 were pending in the present application prior to entry of the present amendments. Claims 1-3, 6, 8-11, and 13-18 were rejected. Claims 4, 5, 7 and 12 were objected to. The Specification was objected to. The drawings filed 22 March 2006 were objected to. Applicant's priority claim under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f) was acknowledged.

By the present amendment, claims 1, 8, 9, 10, 13 and 14 have been amended. Claims 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 11, 12, 15 and 16 have been canceled. New claims 19, 20, 21, and 22 have been submitted for entry. Claim 6, 17, and 18 remain in the application unchanged. Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1, 6, 8-10, 13-14, 17-18, and 19-22 will be present in the application; a total of thirteen claims including five independent claims (1, 10, 14, 19 and 21).

Support for these amendments can be found in the original specification, and thus no new matter has been added. Applicant reserves the right to pursue all original claims in this or other patent applications. Reconsideration and reexamination of the present application is respectfully requested in light of the foregoing amendments and in view of the following remarks, which establish that the pending claims are directed to allowable subject matter.

### **II. Drawings**

The drawings were objected to under 37 CF 1.83(a). The examiner indicated that with respect to claim 15, the detent receiver and said retainer receiver each comprise separate apertures must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). Applicant has cancelled claim 15.

### **III. SPECIFICATION**

The disclosure was objected to because of the following informalities:  
At page 6, line 23, the numeral "76" is not shown in the figures.

At page 6, line 25, the numeral “78” is not shown in any of the figures.

At page 6, line 29, the numeral “78” is not shown in any of the figures.

These numerals have been deleted from the specification.

#### IV. SPECIFICATION-CLAIM REJECTIONS

##### A. *Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112*

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The factual reason for the rejection was not stated. However, applicants have cancelled claim 15.

##### B. *Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and indication of Allowable Subject Matter*

Claims 1-3, 6, 8-11, 13, 14 and 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,349,831 to Buss. Claims 4, 5, 7 and 12 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were noted to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The present invention is distinct from the teachings of Buss. The claims have been amended to more clearly distinguish applicants' invention and thereby obviate the bases for rejection under Buss.

Independent claim 1 was combined with allowable claims 4, 5 and 7 to form three respective new independent claims (namely, 1 amended, 19, and 21). Claim 1 has been combined with claims 3 and 4 to create amended claim 1. Although claim 3 depends upon claim 2, claim 2 is not believed to contain a limitation that is necessary for the allowability of claim 4. Claim 1 has been combined with claims 3 and 5 to create new claim 21. Although claim 5 depends upon claim 4, claim 4 is not believed to have a limitation that is necessary for the allowability of claim 5. Although claim 3 depends upon claim 2, claim 2 is not believed to contain a limitation that is necessary for the allowability of claim 5. Claim 1 has been combined with claims 2 and 7 to create new claim 19.

Applicants believe that their card is distinguishable over the card of Buss. Claim 14 has been amended to more clearly distinguish applicants' invention over the subject matter disclosed by Buss.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

For at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the claims pending in this case and issuance of a patent containing these claims in due course. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would be useful to resolve any concerns and move this application to allowance, he is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below. Otherwise, Applicant respectfully requests timely issuance of a Notice of Allowance for the present application.

PTO-2038 in the amount of \$420.00 for excess dependent claims is being submitted with this response. Applicant believes this fee to be correct however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3447.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael V. Drew  
Reg. No. 30,832  
Attorney for Applicant

Dated: **April 22, 2008**  
PARKS KNOWLTON LLC  
1117 Perimeter Center West  
Suite E402  
Atlanta, Georgia 30338  
(678) 325-6601  
(678) 325-6605 facsimile  
Attorney Docket No.: CPG 03-15 MB